IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE OF
ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE B.PRAKASH RAO
AND
THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAMESH RANGANATHAN

WRIT PETITION NO. 1354 OF 1999

Dated: 4th July, 2006

Between:

Smt. T.Lakshmi Devi

Petitioner

AND

The A.P. Administrative Tribunal,
Hyderabad and others

Respondents

ORDER:
(Per the Hon'ble Sri Justice B.Prakash Rao)

Heard Ms. B.Malleswari, learned counsel for the petitioner and the Government Pleader for Service II.

The petitioner herein, who is the unsuccessful applicant before the A.P. Administrative Tribunal, filed this

writ petition, inter alia seeking writ of certiorari, to quash the order dated 30.11.1998 passed in OA No. 5814 of 1998, rejecting the application filed under Sec. 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985, whereby she challenged the appointment of third respondent herein for the post of Anganwadi Worker of Duggannagaripalli village, Vemula Mandal, Cuddapah District.

The grievance of the petitioner herein is that though the 3rd respondent and herself are equally merited candidates in the interview, the selection of 3rd respondent as Anganwadi Worker is vitiated for the reason that it was made at the instance of local M.L.A. even though she got more marks in SSC examination, and the third respondent has qualified SSC compartmentally. Therefore, she contends that the entire selection process is vitiated.

Counter affidavit filed by the official respondent, shows that the Selection Committee, with the District Collector as Chairman and Local MLA and four others, conducted interviews on 16.5.1998. It is further stated that the selection is made by the District Level Committee and it is not the discretion of the local M.L.A.

Evidently, though the petitioner has attributed certain mala fides in the selection process, they remain

unsubstantiated. The Tribunal below has also adverted to such attribution of mala fides by the petitioner in the selection process and held that such a contention is not proved by evidence. The fact remains that except making a bald allegation, attributing mala fides in the selection process, there is nothing on record to substantiate the same, so as to challenge the correctness of the selection process. Therefore, we do not find any reason to interfere with the impugned order. Consequently, the writ petition fails and is accordingly dismissed. No order as to costs.

_____

B.Prakash Rao, J.

_____

Ramesh Ranganathan, J.

July 4, 2006
MAS